



**RUSSIAN AGENCY FOR PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS (ROSPATENT)
FEDERAL INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY (FIIP)**

Your Re No. SE3432

Our Re No. 2002105526/09 (005828)

In reply please refer to Application No. and date
this document received

June 27, 2003

OFFICIAL ACTION

(21) Application No. 2002105526/09 (005828)

(22) Filing date: May 31, 2002

(86) Application No. PCT/JP01/04606 of 31.05.2001

(71) Applicant: MITSUBISHI HEAVY INDUSTRIES, LTD., BABA
Tsutomu

(51) IPC⁷ H 02 K 21/14, 1/27, 29/00

QUESTIONS, ARGUMENTS, OBJECTIONS, PROPOSALS

The MATERIALS of the application were examined in full and the claimed invention was examined for the scope of the features included by the applicant into the claims.

The examination of the claims under art. 19.4 of Rules-1 revealed the following.

The claims are completely supported by the specification as required by Art. 6 of the PCT (effective since 1 January 1996).

At this stage it is not possible to set priority date for the application because the applicant has not allocated original priority dates to the claims of the application.

The applicant should allocate the priority dates to the claims.

The Examiner finds it important to inform the applicant that the patent search revealed prior art known by the priority date of the claimed group of inventions which on the Examiner's opinion make it impossible to accept the invention as patentable in the formulations of independent claims 1, 17, 18 and 19.

1. A brushless motor comprising a stator and a rotor having a lateral surface opposed to the stator wherein the stator includes a plurality of radially extending iron cores and a plurality of windings for respectively generating magnetic fields in the iron cores, the rotor includes a plurality of permanent magnets and magnetic force line induction bodies located between the permanent magnets and the lateral surface is known from prior art (see, for example, patent JP 10-126985 A, H 02 K 1/27, 05.05.1998, 4 pages).

The above solution has features identical to all features of present claim 1. The claimed invention cannot be accepted as patentable because it lacks novelty according to art. 19.5.1.(3) of the Rules.

2. From prior art an electric motor drive vehicle is known. The rotor of the motor drives the wheels, there is a powerful power source for the motor (see, for example, published application RU 94021358 A1, B 60 L 11/02, 27.08.1996 – 27 pages).

This solution can be taken as the closest reference to the object of the invention of claim 17.

The claimed invention of claim 17 differs from the prior art in that the motor is a brushless one according to claim 1. To the applicant's opinion that provides a decrease in the power of amplifier of a vehicle due to properties of brushless motor of the claimed construction characterized

by high torque, low pulsing, low rotor current and input voltage as well as very small size.

However, as was mentioned earlier, such brushless motor having all cited above features and properties is known, for example, from patent JP 10-126985 A.

Thus, the invention of claim 17 is based on adding one known means (cited reference) with the other known part wherein the addition is done by known rules for achieving technical result, for which the affect of such addition, i.e. depending on the properties of known brushless motor, is also known.

Such invention cannot be accepted as it lacks inventive step under art. 19.5.3.(3) of the Rules.

3. An electric car is known from prior art. It comprises drive wheels, an electric motor with a rotor driving the drive wheels, and a powerful voltage supplier for supplying power to said electric motor depending on movements of accelerator pedal see, for example, published application RU 94021358 A1, B 60 L 11/02, 27.08.1996 – 27 pages).

This solution was taken as the closest reference to the object of invention of claim 18.

The claimed invention of claim 18 differs from the prior art in that the motor is a brushless one according to claim 1. To the applicant's opinion that provides a decrease in the power of amplifier of a car due to properties of brushless motor of the claimed construction characterized by high torque, low pulsing, low rotor current and input voltage as well as very small size.

However, as stated earlier, such brushless motor having all cited features and properties is already known, for example, from JP 10-126985 A.

Thus, the invention of claim 18 is based on adding one known means (cited reference) with the other known part wherein the addition is done by known rules for achieving technical result, for which the affect of such addition, i.e. depending on the properties of known brushless motor, is also known.

Such invention cannot be accepted as it lacks inventive step under art. 19.5.3.(3) of the Rules.

4. A transport means with electric drive, for example, an electric train, comprising drive wheels, an electric motor with rotor with a rotor driving the drive wheels, and a powerful voltage supplier for supplying power to said electric motor depending on movements of a throttle lever is known from prior art (see, for example, patent RU 2022824 C1, B 60 L 11/00, 15.11.1994 – 11 pages).

This solution can be taken as the closest reference to the object of invention of claim 19.

The claimed invention of claim 19 differs from the prior art in that the motor is a brushless one according to claim 1. To the applicant's opinion that provides a decrease in the power of amplifier of an electric train due to properties of brushless motor of the claimed construction characterized by high torque, low pulsing, low rotor current and input voltage as well as very small size.

However, as stated earlier, such brushless motor having all cited features and properties is already known, for example, from JP 10-126985 A.

Thus, the invention of claim 19 is based on adding one known means (cited reference) with the other known part wherein the addition is done by known rules for achieving technical result, for which the affect of such addition, i.e. depending on the properties of known brushless motor, is also known.

Such invention cannot be accepted as it lacks inventive step under art. 19.5.3.(3) of the Rules.

The applicant is advised to review all Examiner's objections and arguments and the cited references and express own opinion regarding them, and file amended set of claims (art. 9 of the Rules).

It should be remembered that any amendment must not change the subject matter of the inventions, i.e. it should remain in the frame of the originally filed application (see art. 20.(4) of the Rules).

Chief State Patent Examiner
Department of Electrical and
Radio Engineering

signature

K.I. Kalashnikova